DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 410 FL 022 185

AUTHOR	Rivera, Natasha F.
TITLE	Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education, Community School District 3, 1992-93. Final Evaluation Report. OREA Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	13 Sep 93
CONTRACT	T003600091
NOTE	183p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Educational Research, Board of Education of the City of New York, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education Programs; *English (Second Language); Inservice Teacher Education; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; *Limited English Speaking; Mathematics Instruction; Middle Schools; Parent Participation; Program Effectiveness; Public Schools; Science Instruction; Second Language Instruction; Social Studies; Spanish Speaking; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	New York City Board of Education; *Two Way Bilingual Education

ABSTRACT

The federally funded Model Development Program of Bilingual Education served 385 students at one elementary and one middle school in Manhattan (New York) in 1992-93, its third year of operation. Participants included 168 native Spanish-speaking, limited-English-proficient (LEP) students and 217 English-proficient (EP) students, both language-minority and English language background. Instruction was provided in English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) for LEP students, Spanish as a second language (SSL) for EP students, and content areas using a dual-language approach. The program also included a broad staff development component and a strong parental involvement component including high school equivalency courses, college instruction, ESL classes, and other activities. Participating LEP students were selected based on an achievement lag of one year in content areas; EP students were admitted on request. The project met its objectives for ESL, staff development for ongoing education and teacher trainees, and two aspects of parent involvement. It did not meet the reading objective for EP students. Attainment of objectives in SSL, mathematics, and reading for LEP students and in staff development for content-area teaching could not be assessed. Recommendations for improvement include modification of one staff development objective and exploration of EP students' lack of gain in reading. (MSE)

ED 370 410

OREA Report

Model Developmental Program
of Bilingual Education
Community School District 3
1992-93
Grant Number T003600091
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Tobias
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL022185

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL

Model Developmental Program
of Bilingual Education
Community School District 3
1992-93
Grant Number T003600091
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Ms. Ruth Swinney, Project Director
Community School District 3
300 West 96th Street
New York, NY 10219

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Carol A. Gresser
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Victor Gotbaum
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra-Vélez
Dennis M. Walcott
Members

Andrea Schlesinger
Student Advisory Member

Ramon C. Cortines
Chancellor

9/13/93

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3320.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education was an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) Title VII-funded project in its third year in 1992-93. The project functioned at P.S. 84 and the Dual Language Middle School in Community School District (C.S.D.) 3, Manhattan. Of the 385 students served in the year under review, 168 were Spanish-speaking students of limited English proficiency (LEP) and 217 were English-proficient (EP)—138 language-minority and 79 English language-background students.

The project provided English as a second language (E.S.L.) instruction to LEP students and Spanish as a Second Language (S.S.L.) instruction to EP students. It offered content area instruction with a dual language approach (English and Spanish were each used one-half of the time in kindergarten through grade four and in a ratio of 65:35 in grades five through eight).

The Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education included a broad staff development component for teachers of participating students. The project also offered tuition reimbursement for staff taking pertinent college courses. There was a strong parental component, including general education diploma (G.E.D.) courses, a State Education Department program at Mercy College, E.S.L. classes, educational field trips, workshops, and other activities.

The project admitted LEP students (those who scored at or below the 40th percentile on the Language Assessment Battery [LAB]) who showed an achievement lag of more than one year in one or more content areas as measured by standardized achievement tests. EP students were admitted on request, with their parents' consent. The project also took into consideration teacher recommendation for participation of both EP and LEP students.

The project met its objectives for E.S.L., staff development for ongoing education and teacher trainees, and the parental involvement objectives for increased skills and training parents as volunteers. It did not meet the reading objective for EP students. The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) could not measure the objectives in S.S.L., mathematics, and reading for LEP students, since the instruments for measuring them were used for the first time in the year under review. OREA was unable to evaluate the staff development objective for staff performance related to content area instruction because as in previous years, the project did not develop the required evaluation indicator.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations to the project:

- Request modification of the staff development objective to make it possible for OREA to evaluate it in the future.

- Explore reasons for the lack of gains on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) test by EP students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been prepared by the Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood Evaluation Unit of the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment. Thanks are due to Ms. Natasha F. Rivera for collecting the data and writing the report.

Additional copies of this report are available from:

Dr. Tomi Deutsch Berney
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Board of Education of the City of New York
110 Livingston Street, Room 732
Brooklyn, NY 11201
(718) 935-3790 FAX (718) 935-5490

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Project Context	1
Students' Characteristics	2
Project Objectives	3
Project Implementation	4
Parent and Community Involvement Activities	9
II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	10
Evaluation Design	10
Instruments of Measurement	11
Data Collection and Analysis	14
III. FINDINGS	16
Participants Educational Progress	16
Former Participants Progress in English Language Classroom	22
Overall Educational Progress Achieved Through Project	22
Staff Development Outcomes	23
Parental Involvement Outcomes	25
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	27
Achievement of Objectives	27
Most and Least Effective Components	27
Recommendation to Enhance Project Effectiveness	28

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1	Project Staff Qualifications	6
TABLE 2	Qualifications of Other Staff Serving Project Students	8
TABLE 3	Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Language Assessment Battery, by Grade, LEP Students	18
TABLE 4	Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on El Examen de Lectura en Español, by Grade, LEP Students	20
TABLE 5	Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) Test), by Grade, EP Students	21

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1992-93, the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education was in its third year of funding as an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) Title VII project.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The project operated at P.S. 84 and the Dual Language Middle School in Community School District (C.S.D.) 3 in Manhattan. The student population in C.S.D. 3 was 39 percent Latino and 47 percent African-American; the remaining students were European-American and Asian-American. Most (74 percent) of the students in the district came from low-income families and were eligible for the free-lunch program.

At P.S. 84, of the 637 students enrolled in 1992-93, 54.3 percent were Latino, 33 percent were African-American, 9.3 percent were European-American, and 3.4 percent were Asian-American. Sixty-nine percent came from low-income families. The Dual Language Middle School enrolled 139 students, of whom 99 percent were Latino and 1 percent were African-American. Ninety-eight percent of these students came from low-income families, and 43 percent were LEP.

Though P.S. 84 and the Dual Language Middle School were housed in an old building, classrooms were clean and bright. Photographs of the students, as well as their writings and art, decorated the walls. Bulletin boards in the well-lit halls were colorful and topical. All written materials on display throughout the school were in both English and Spanish.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

The project served a total of 385 students. Male students numbered 170 (44.2 percent), female 170 (44.2 percent); data were not available for 45 students (11.6 percent.) Of the 351 students for whom data were reported, 168 (43.6 percent) were LEP, and 217 (56.4 percent) were English proficient (EP). Scores on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB) at or below the 40th percentile determined LEP status.

The majority of the project participants (89.7 percent) came from Spanish-speaking families but were born and brought up in the United States. The students who were not born in the United States had a mean of 3.4 years (s.d.=1.8) of education in their native country and a mean of 4.3 years (s.d.= 2.3) of education in the United States. Eighty-three percent of the participants came from low-income families and were eligible for the free-lunch program.

Needs Assessment

Before instituting this program, C.S.D. 3 conducted an exhaustive needs assessment of the targeted LEP and EP students, their families, and the educational staff who were to serve them. The data obtained from this study indicated three primary needs: (1) to provide LEP students with intensive language instruction and support services to improve their school performance, (2) to offer staff development activities for teachers and paraprofessionals, (3) to satisfy parents of EP students who greatly desired second-language instruction for their children.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Student Objectives

- By the conclusion of the student development period (from September 1992 to June 1993), 246 kindergarten to sixth grade students (approximately 50 percent LEP and 50 percent EP students) will demonstrate Spanish and English language gains (in both native and second languages) in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the major content areas.

- By the conclusion of the student development period (from September 1992 to June 1993), 139 sixth to eighth grade students (approximately 50 percent LEP and 50 percent EP students) will demonstrate Spanish and English language gains (in both native and second languages) in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the major content areas as a result of participation in a program of developmental bilingual education.

Staff Development Objectives

- Thirty-five percent of the trainees will enroll in and complete at least three college credits in appropriate developmental bilingual courses.

- Forty percent of the teacher trainees will achieve scores of 90 percent or better on program-developed criterion referenced tests related to content area instruction depending on which content area training within which they participated.

- Thirty-five percent of the teacher trainees will be able to utilize developmental bilingual instructional methodologies when working with target pupils and supervise and support paraprofessional involvement with small groups of target pupils.

Parental Involvement Objectives

- Seventy percent of the parent participants will increase skills and knowledge in the areas within which they took instruction, such as E.S.L./S.S.L., native language arts, high school equivalence, computer learning, home-based remediation and enrichment for students, how to make instructional materials from household items, basic intermediate and advanced conversational English/Spanish for adults, and citizenship education.

- Fifteen percent of the parent participants will master skills sufficient for them to work as effective school volunteers.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

During the 1992-93 school year, the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education provided instructional and support services to 385 Spanish- and English-speaking students and their families. Two hundred and seventeen (56.4 percent) of these students were EP, and 168 (43.6 percent) were LEP. The project's main goal was to promote the acquisition of English language skills by LEP students and Spanish language skills by EP students through an enriched curriculum in all subject areas. At the same time, the project aimed to develop greater understanding of and appreciation for cultural and linguistic diversity. The project used developmental bilingual instructional methodologies, including a partial immersion model, and a wide variety of activities to achieve its goals.

The project provided parental involvement activities, including a State Education Department (S.E.D.) program at Mercy College for high school equivalency and college-credit courses. In-service staff development activities and reimbursement to staff for college credits were also an integral part of programming.

Capacity Building

Next year, fifty-two percent of the salaries of the project director and the project secretary will be paid by C.S.D. 3. The district will also pay part of the salaries of the School Neighborhood Worker and the Language Development Specialist, as well as part of the traveling expenses for staff development, instructional materials, postage, and telephone bills.

Materials, Methods, and Techniques

Teachers of participating students used a wide array of instructional strategies and techniques, including cooperative learning groups; whole language learning; manipulatives; hands-on activities in the lower grades; and reading groups, student-produced newsletters, and research projects and experiments in higher grades. The project incorporated a strong cultural component into its various curricula in order to foster knowledge of the students' native culture and promote an understanding of other cultures.

Kindergarten through second grade students had one teacher for all subjects; content area instruction was in English one day and Spanish the next. Third and fourth grade classes had two teachers and two classrooms, one for Spanish and one for English; students alternated days. Fifth through eighth grade students had multiple teachers; instruction in content areas was in Spanish 35 percent of the time and in English 65 percent of the time.

As in previous years, the project offered the Latin American Writing Project, in which Latino and other writers spent ten weeks visiting different classes. Students had the opportunity to meet real-life role models, discuss the processes that go into writing and publishing a book, and subsequently to put together class books.

Also in previous years, the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education updated and disseminated a pamphlet in Spanish and English describing the philosophy, goals, and design of the program.

For a list of instructional materials used in the project, see Appendix A.

Staff Qualifications

Title VII staff. The project's Title VII staff included the project director, a language development specialist, a school neighborhood worker, and a secretary. For a description of degrees held, certification, and language competencies, teaching or communicative,* see Table 1.

TABLE 1
Project Staff Qualifications

Position Title	Degree(s)	Spanish Language Proficiency
Project Director	M.A.	TP, N.S.*
Language Development Specialist	M.A.	TP, N.S.*
School Neighborhood Worker	A.A.	CP
Secretary	H.S.	N.P.*

*N.S.: native speaker; N.P.: no proficiency

The director had 21 years of experience in teaching LEP students. Her responsibilities included the supervision and coordination of the project's activities, staff selection and training, and providing OREA with the necessary information for

*Teaching proficiency (TP) is defined as the ability to use LEP students' native language in teaching language arts or other academic subjects. Communicative proficiency (CP) is defined as a non-native speaker's basic ability to communicate and interact with students in their native language.

the project's evaluation. She also gave presentations about the project at the State Association for Bilingual Education (SABE) and the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) annual conferences.

The language development specialist had more than 11 years of experience. She assisted classroom teachers in the formulation and implementation of developmental instructional activities, provided in-service activities and training to parents and teachers of participating students, and selected instructional material.

The school neighborhood worker assisted in the dissemination of information, helped organize and conduct parental involvement activities, and served as a parent ombudsman.

Other staff. Tax-levy funds paid the salaries of the 20 classroom teachers and additional support personnel who provided instructional services to project students. For language proficiencies, certifications, and degrees, see Table 2.

TABLE 2

Qualifications of Other Staff Serving Project Students

Position Title	Degrees	Certificates	Spanish Language Proficiency
20 Teachers	14 Masters 11 Professional Certificates	19 Bilingual Common branches 1 Common branches	19 TP, all N.S. 1 CP

Teachers had from one to six years of experience teaching LEP and EP students, and all had training in bilingual and multicultural education. All teachers met the appropriate New York State certification requirements for their respective areas of instruction.

Staff development. Teachers of project students participated in a series of monthly and weekly activities sponsored by the bilingual district office, including workshops that focused on Spanish-language and E.S.L. activities, and reading in a dual-language curriculum. Teachers received tuition assistance toward college-level courses in bilingual education and had the opportunity to observe experienced teachers, who presented new approaches and methodologies.

Length of Time Participants Received Instruction

Students who were not born in the United States had a mean of 3.4 years (s.d.=1.8) of education in their native country and a mean of 4.3 years (s.d.= 2.3) of education in the United States.

PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

The project sponsored a wide variety of parental involvement activities that included weekly workshops, E.S.L. and Spanish as a Second Language (S.S.L.) classes, field trips, and a S.E.D. program at Mercy College for parents to obtain a General Equivalency Diploma.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION DESIGN

Project Group's Educational Progress as Compared to that of an Appropriate Non-Project Group

OREA used a gap reduction design to evaluate the effect of language instruction on project students' performance on standardized tests. Because of the difficulty in finding a valid comparison group, OREA used instead the groups on which the tests were normed. Test scores are reported in Normal Curve Equivalents (N.C.E.s), which are normalized standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21.1. It is assumed that the norm group has a zero gain in N.C.E.s in the absence of supplementary instruction and that participating students' gains are attributable to project services.

Applicability of Conclusions to All Persons Served by Project

Data were collected from all participating students for whom there were pre- and posttest scores. (There were no pretest data on students who entered the program late; therefore, posttest data for them will serve as pretest data for the following year.) Instruments used to measure educational progress were appropriate for the students involved. The LAB, El Examen de Lectura en Español (ELE), and the Metropolitan Achievement Test for Mathematics (replaced by the California Achievement Test [CAT] in spring 1993) are used throughout New York City to assess the growth of English, Spanish, and mathematics skills in populations similar to those served by the Model Developmental Project of Bilingual Education.

INSTRUMENTS OF MEASUREMENT

OREA compared pre- and posttest scores on the LAB and the D.R.P. to assess the E.S.L. objective, and the ELE to assess the N.L.A. objective. The content area objective was assessed through course grades, as specified. The mathematics objective posed special difficulties for evaluation. In the year under review, the Board of Education adopted the Concepts and Applications subtest of the California Achievement Test (CAT) as a citywide mathematics test. This instrument differs in approach and emphasis from the MAT, which students took the previous year. It is difficult to compare results from one instrument to the other. On account of language-specific adaptations in the versions of each test, these difficulties are particularly acute in the case of students who took the test in a language other than English. For the evaluation of bilingual programs in the year under review, therefore, OREA is reporting CAT scores without attempting to compute pre/post gains. In the following year, when both pre- and posttest scores will be fully comparable, the mathematics objective will be evaluated as written.

All students were tested at the appropriate grade level. The language of the LAB and ELE was determined by the test itself, whereas the language of the MAT-Math and Math Concepts and Applications Subtest of the CAT was determined by the language in which the student received instruction in mathematics.

According to the publishers' test manuals, all standardized tests used to gauge project students' progress are valid and reliable. Evidence supporting both content and construct validity is available for the LAB. Content validity is confirmed by an

item-objective match and includes grade-by-grade item difficulties, correlations between subtests, and the relationship between the performance of students who are native speakers of English and students who are LEP. To support reliability, the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (KR20) coefficients and standard errors of measurement (SEM) are reported by grade and by form for each subtest and total test. Grade reliability coefficients, based on the performance of LEP students on the English version, ranged from .88 to .96 for individual subtests and from .95 to .98 for the total test.

Evidence is available to support the validity of the D.R.P. The D.R.P. is an objective-referenced test, with the single outcome objective being the comprehension of expository English text. Criterion validity of the D.R.P. is demonstrated by the presence of a correlation (r=.90) with results from a criterion-referenced instrument, the Word Completion Test. To support reliability, the KR20 coefficients and SEM are reported by grade. Reliability coefficients ranged from .91 to .97 for students in the second through the tenth grade; the SEM ranged from 2.6 to 3.8 raw score units.

El Examen de Lectura en Español (ELE) was prepared by New York City educators who were native speakers of Spanish and represented several Latino linguistic and cultural groups. The ELE was administered in two forms to all New York City students who were receiving language arts instruction in Spanish. For form 1, the grade reliability coefficients ranged from .94 to .96. Comparable data for form 2 will be generated as soon as possible after its administration in the spring of 1993. Items on the test were grade-specific. Construct validity is evidenced by

grade-to-grade decreases in item difficulty within level. This characteristic reflects the acquisition of increased amounts of the underlying construct (reading proficiency) as students progress through the grades.

For the Math Concepts and Applications Subtest of the CAT, content validity was determined by comparing the content descriptions and the test items with particular curriculum objectives. The KR20 was used as a measure of internal consistency. The SEM is also reported in order to indicate the range within which students' true scores are likely to fall. For the Math Concepts and Applications subtest given in second through eighth grade, the number of items ranged from 42 to 50. KR20 coefficients ranged from 0.88 to 0.91; SEM ranged from 2.55 to 3.09 raw score units.

To assess the objectives for the ongoing education of teachers, OREA examined transcripts from the institution in which the staff members enrolled. OREA also developed and distributed Likert-type evaluation questionnaires and/or staff development surveys for teachers to rate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of staff development activities (see Appendix B). Because the project did not develop its proposed criterion-referenced test, OREA could not assess the staff development objective for achievement in content area instruction.

In order to assess the parental involvement objectives, OREA developed and used a Likert-type questionnaire and/or parent involvement surveys (see Appendix B). The objective for parents' ability to work as effective classroom volunteers was measured by interviews with the principal.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Data Collection

To gather qualitative data, an OREA evaluation consultant carried out on-site and telephone interviews of the project director several times during the school year and also observed two classes on each of two visits. The project evaluator collected the data and prepared the final evaluation report in accordance with the New York State E.S.E.A. Title VII Bilingual Education Final Evaluation Report format, which was adapted from a checklist developed by the staff of the Evaluation Assistance Center (EAC) East in consultation with the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA).

Proper Administration of Instruments

Qualified personnel received training in testing procedures and administered the tests. Test administrators followed guidelines set forth in the manuals accompanying standardized tests. Time limits for subtests were adhered to; directions were given exactly as presented in the manual.

Testing at Twelve-Month Intervals

Standardized tests were given at 12-month intervals, following published norming dates.

Data Analysis

Accurate scoring and transcription of results. Scoring, score conversions, and data processing were accomplished electronically by the Scan Center of the Board of Education of the City of New York. Data provided by the Scan Center were analyzed

in the Bilingual, Multicultural, and Early Childhood Evaluation Unit of OREA. Data collectors, processors, and analysts were unbiased and had no vested interest in the success of the project.

Use of analyses and reporting procedures appropriate for obtained data. To assess the significance of students' achievement in English and Spanish, OREA computed a correlated *t*-test on the LAB, and ELE N.C.E. scores. The *t*-test determined whether the difference between the pre- and posttest scores was significantly greater than would be expected from chance variation alone.

The only possible threat to the validity of any of the above instruments might be that LAB norms were based on the performance of EP rather than LEP students. Since OREA was examining gains, however, this threat was inconsequential—the choice of norming groups should not affect the existence of gains.

III. FINDINGS

PARTICIPANTS' EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

The Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education carried out all instructional activities specified in its original design. Throughout the school year, students had ample opportunity to develop their native and second language skills.

LEP and EP Participants' Progress in Native and Second Languages

An OREA evaluation consultant observed two classes in P.S. 84. One was a combined first and second grade class of 27 students. The room was very bright, and students' work was prominently displayed. There was a science experiment center that included a number of live animals to observe and study.

The lesson was on creative writing. Students worked independently at their own pace. Emphasis was put on content rather than spelling. Students drew pictures at the bottom of the page and then wrote about the pictures. The lesson was conducted in Spanish; some students talked in English to their peers. If students had difficulty with a word, they went to the teacher, who pronounced it slowly for them, allowing the student to decode the word. Students could also request help from their peers. The teacher and paraprofessional walked around the class, offering additional help as needed.

A second and third grade mathematics class was also observed by the OREA consultant. It was the day instruction was in English. The classroom was well-lit, and had a rug, a piano, and displays of students' work. Students who finished their

exercises could help others who were having difficulty. The class was individually paced, and the teacher allowed enough time for students to complete their work.

The project proposed the following objectives for English and Spanish language development:

- By the conclusion of the student development period (from September 1992 to June 1993), 246 kindergarten to sixth grade students (approximately 50 percent LEP and 50 percent EP students) will demonstrate Spanish and English language gains (in both native and second languages) in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the major content areas.

- By the conclusion of the student development period (from September 1992 to June 1993), 139 sixth to eighth grade students (approximately 50 percent LEP and 50 percent EP students) will demonstrate Spanish and English language gains (in both native and second languages) in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and the major content areas as a result of participation in a program of developmental bilingual education.

For LEP students, there were complete pre- and posttest scores on the LAB for 121 students from grades one through eight. Gains for these students were statistically significant (14.3 N.C.E.s) and higher than that of the previous year (3.6 N.C.E.s). (See Table 3.)

Most students had taken the Spanish Assessment of Bilingual Education (SABE) test the previous year. Pre/post ELE scores were available for only 15 students, who showed a small overall of 1.1 N.C.E.s. (See Table 4.) Significance of the gain could not be assessed because findings were based on too small a number of scores.

TABLE 3

Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the Language Assessment Battery, by Grade

LEP Students (English Language Gains)

Grade	Number of students for whom data were available	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		*t* value
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
K	15	13.8	15.4	45.9	30.7	32.1	26.5	4.70*
1	19	17.2	8.8	26.5	13.1	9.4	10.8	3.78*
2	23	15.1	7.3	34.6	24.5	19.4	21.4	4.35*
3	11	15.1	12.6	20.1	18.9	5.0	11.7	1.42
4	8	15.5	7.5	25.4	23.4	7.9	21.7	1.03
5	13	17.6	14.2	33.1	23.7	15.5	18.3	3.05*
6	11	15.5	10.9	20.1	15.5	4.6	15.7	1.05
7	10	22.3	13.6	31.7	14.0	9.4	13.1	2.28*
8	11	21.7	14.2	36.1	20.8	14.4	14.2	3.35*
Total	121	16.9	11.6	31.2	22.2	14.3	19.3	8.14*

*$p<.05$

- Project students in grades K, 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 made significant gains on the LAB.

CAT scores were available for 146 EP students in grades K through eight. The mean N.C.E. score for EP students was 48.80 (s.d.=20.41). For reasons explained in the chapter on Evaluation Methodology, OREA did not attempt to compute pre/posttest gains.

OREA obtained CAT scores for 85 LEP students in grades K through eight. The mean N.C.E. score for LEP students was 39.62 (s.d.=19.60). For reasons explained in the chapter on Evaluation Methodology, OREA did not attempt to computer pre/posttest gains.

OREA analyzed complete pre- and posttest scores from the D.R.P. test for 122 EP students from grades three through eight. Overall scores were lower than that of the year prior to the one under review, although fourth, seventh, and eighth grades showed an improvement. (See Table 5.)

Project students met the objective for gains in E.S.L. The project did not meet the English language objective. OREA could not evaluate the mathematics objective. S.S.L. scores were up, but were too few in number for OREA to ascertain their significance. Last year, the project met its objectives for E.S.L. and its mathematics objective for LEP students; it failed to meet objectives for S.S.L. (again there were too few scores), mathematics for EP students, and reading for EP students.

TABLE 4

Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on
El Examen de Lectura en Español, by Grade

EP Students (Spanish Language Gains)

Grade*	Total number of project students	Number of students for whom data were available	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		*t* value
			Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
3	25	3	44.7	11.0	53.7	10.0	9.0	9.5	1.63
6	22	5	47.6	21.5	47.8	13.2	0.2	9.1	0.05
7	33	4	66.8	25.4	67.5	13.7	0.8	15.4	0.10
8	25	3	58.3	12.7	53.3	18.4	-5.0	19.1	-0.45
Total	105	15	54.3	19.9	55.3	14.7	1.1	12.7	0.33

*Data were not available for fourth and fifth grades.

- Project students did not show a significant gain on the ELE but the sample size was so small that the results could not be considered representative.

TABLE 5

Pretest/Posttest N.C.E. Differences on the
Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) Test, by Grade

EP Students

Grade	Total number of project students	Number of students for whom data were available	Pretest		Posttest		Difference		*t* value
			Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
3	25	17	46.2	17.1	32.5	11.1	-13.6	10.9	-5.18
4	20	20	44.0	24.7	46.2	25.0	2.2	14.2	0.68
5	16	15	58.7	27.2	49.5	29.1	-9.1	18.0	-1.96
6	22	20	41.2	16.0	33.8	17.6	-7.4	8.7	-3.82
7	33	31	47.3	18.6	50.5	16.6	3.2	10.2	1.76
8	25	19	48.8	15.8	50.1	11.3	1.3	10.5	0.52
Total		122	47.2	20.2	44.4	20.2	-2.9	13.4	-2.36

*$p<.05$

- Project students in half the grades showed a gain on the D.R.P.

FORMER PARTICIPANTS' PROGRESS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS

Graduates of the Dual Language Middle School were to continue their education in mainstream classes around the city. It was not possible to follow them and obtain data on their academic performance.

OVERALL EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS ACHIEVED THROUGH PROJECT

Mainstreaming

By definition, a developmental bilingual education program does not require mainstreaming. Participating students remain in the program for its duration and then graduate to a mainstream high school.

Grade Retention

The Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education did not propose any objectives for grade retention. During the year under review, the project did not retain any students in grade. In the previous year, four project students (1.0 percent) were retained in grade.

Attendance

The Model Developmental Program for Bilingual Education did not propose any objectives for attendance. OREA, however, finds attendance information to be significant in the evaluation of bilingual projects and is presenting it below.

The overall attendance rate for the project was 88.2 percent, based on 202 students. Last year the attendance rate for participating students was 89.3 percent.

Referral and Placement in Special Education Programs

As in previous years, the project did not refer any students to special education programs.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

- Thirty-five percent of the trainees will enroll in and complete at least three college credits in appropriate developmental bilingual courses.

The project provided tuition assistance to program teachers. During the 1992-93 school year, seven (35.0 percent) of the teachers completed more than three credits in bilingual education, including a three-credit course in conflict resolution at Teacher's College.

As it did last year, the project met its staff development objective for ongoing education.

- Forty percent of the teacher trainees will achieve scores of 90 percent or better on program-developed criterion referenced tests related to content area instruction depending on the content area training within which they participated.

The project did not develop the criterion-referenced test, therefore OREA was unable to evaluate attainment of the objective for teacher performance related to content area instruction. Last year, OREA had been unable to evaluate the objective for the same reason.

- Thirty-five percent of the teacher trainees will be able to utilize developmental bilingual instructional methodologies when working with target pupils and supervise and support paraprofessional involvement with small groups of target pupils.

Teachers of participating students participated in a series of monthly and weekly activities, including workshops sponsored by the C.S.D.'s bilingual office. Workshops focused on Spanish and E.S.L. language activities as well as reading and literature in the dual language curriculum. Topics such as "Semantic Mapping," "Multicultural Education," "The Writing Process," "Hands-on, Minds on Science," "Language Development," and "Material Making for Centers" were part of this year's staff development for the project. A total of 17 workshops were open to all the teachers in the district and were attended by an average of five teachers.

To assess this objective, the project distributed a Likert-type evaluation questionnaire to staff at the end of the school year. A total of 9 completed questionnaires were returned to OREA. All respondents rated the staff development activities as superior. Teacher trainers felt that they had gained extensive knowledge from these activities and thought that they were extremely useful.

The project also distributed a workshop evaluation form after each session. All teacher trainers rated the workshops as being of superior quality.

The project met its staff development training objectives, as it had done last year.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT OUTCOMES

- Seventy percent of the parent participants will increase skills and knowledge in the areas within which they took instruction, such as E.S.L./S.S.L., native language arts, high school equivalence, computer learning, home-based remediation and enrichment for students, how to make instructional materials from household items, basic intermediate and advanced conversational English/Spanish for adults, and citizenship education.

The project offered parents of participating students a wide variety of activities, including E.S.L. and S.S.L. classes, craft workshops, meetings on alcohol abuse, and parent volunteer training. At the end of each activity, the project distributed an OREA-developed Likert-type survey on which parents could rate how much they had learned and how useful and interesting they found the activity. OREA received a total of 52 completed surveys. One hundred percent of the respondents considered that they had learned a lot from the activities and that the activities were useful and interesting.

The project also sponsored an S.E.D.-funded program at Mercy College that offered G.E.D. preparation to parents of participating students and gave them the opportunity to start a college education.

As in the previous years, the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education met its parental involvement objective for increased skills and knowledge.

- Fifteen percent of the parent participants will master skills sufficient for them to work as effective school volunteers.

During the 1992-93 school year, a total of 27 project parents volunteered and were approved by the principal to work in varied activities throughout the school. These included helping teachers in the classroom, tutoring in reading, chaperoning

field trips, helping organize and carry out school celebrations and extracurricular activities, recruiting new parents into the project, and speaking on their cultural background.

The project met its parental involvement objective for parent volunteers as it had done last year.

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The project met its objectives for E.S.L., staff development for ongoing education and teacher trainee workshops, parental involvement for increased skills and knowledge, and parents as volunteers. It did not meet the objective for reading for its EP students. As in previous years, OREA was unable to evaluate the staff development objective for staff performance related to content area instruction. Since the project's instruments of measurement for Spanish reading for LEP students were used for the first time this year, OREA did not obtain the necessary pre- and posttest data to evaluate the objective in this area. OREA was unable to evaluate the mathematics objective.

Project services benefited students academically while increasing their awareness of their own and other cultures. Teachers of participating students improved their teaching techniques by attending various workshops and seminars during the school year. Parents of participating students also benefited from the program by attending workshops, and E.S.L classes and taking part in the Mercy College program.

MOST AND LEAST EFFECTIVE COMPONENTS

The strength of the Model Developmental Program of Bilingual Education lay in its ability to provide students with a nurturing environment that facilitated the acquisition of English for LEP students and Spanish for EP students. The staff

development and parental involvement components of the program were also successful in training both parents and teachers.

A weakness lay in the lack of gains achieved by students on the D.R.P. test.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENHANCE PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

- Request modification of the evaluation indicator for the staff development objective to make it possible for OREA to evaluate it in the future.
- Explore reasons for the lack of gain on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) test by EP students.

Selected Bibliography of Spanish Books

District 3
Compiled by Ruth A. Swinney

Bilingual Publications
270 Lafayette Street (at Prince)
New York, N.Y. 10012
Vendor # BIL 004000
Contract # 6209400

For teachers. Resource books:

"A la Sombra de un Verde Limón". Antología del cancionero tradicional argentino. (Comp. Paulina Movsichoff)

"A la Una Sale la Luna" Juegos tradicionales infantiles. (Comp. Paulina Movsichoff)

"Canciones de Nana y Desvelo" (Carmen Conde)

"La Foca Loca". Marial Elena Walsh

5/6/7 grade

"Arhuaco. Sierra Nevada" (Bengt Arne Runnerstrom) Documentary story about the indians of the Sierra Nevada in Colombia, written by a Danish anthropologist, under a grant from the Nicaragua Ministry of Culture. Great research source for a 5/6/7/8 class.

"Canciones de Nana y Desvelo" (Carmen Conde) Wonderful collection of poems. Won National prize for children's literature in Spain in 1987.

"Chaucha y Palito." (Maria Elena Walsh) A collection of five stories. Funny and imaginative, as all the stories of this author. Reading level 7th/8th grade . Fairly complicated sentence structure, difficult vocabulary.

"Cuentopos de Gulubu." (Maria Elena Walsh) Collection of short stories for children.. Fairly complicated sentence structure. The book can be read to 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade children. The images are very appealing to young children. Reading level 6th grade.

"Cuentos de Enredos y Travesuras"
"Como Surgieron Los Seres y las Cosas."
"Cuentos de Leyendas de Amor para Niños." These three books contain a wonderful collection of traditional children stories and myths from Latin America. The illustrations are beautiful. The books are an invaluable source of cultural enrichment for all those interested in learning about the Hispanic cultures. Reading level 5th/6th grade. Complicated sentence structure.
"Cuentos Populares Rusos" Beautiful collection of folktales from Russia. Fairly complicated language structure. 5/6/7 reading level.

"Cuentos y Leyendas de Guatemala". (Francisco Barnoya Galvez)

"Dailan Kifki." (Maria Elena Walsh) Charming story about an elephant. Complicated vocabulary and sentence structure. Reading level 7th/8th grade.

"El Regreso de McBroom" (Sid Fleischman) Three stories about a farmer. Very complicated sentence structure and vocabulary. Translated from English. Reading level 6/7.

"El Reino del Reves." (Maria Elena Walsh) Very clever and funny book of songs and poetry for older children. Reading level 5th/6th grade.

"El Topo." (William Mayne, illustrated by Nicola Bayley) Beautiful story with outstanding illustrations. Fairly sophisticated language, but on a 4/5 reading level.

"El Unicornio y el Mar." (Fiona Moodie) Wonderful story translated from German. Very artistic illustrations. Fairly easy sentence structure. Easy vocabulary. Reading level 4/5/6.

"El Viaje de Dos Niños Miskitos por el Rio Coco". Story incorporating the experiences of two European social workers during time spent with the Miskita indian communities in Nicaragua. Wonderfully illustrated book., A very important cultural contribution. A must for any upper grade classroom. Complex language. Reading level 5/6.

"Fabulas y Leyendas Americanas" (Ciro Alegria) Wonderful collection. Fairly complicated language. 6/7 reading level.

"Florian y el Tractor Max." (Binette Schroeder) Very creative story translated from German. Fairly complicated language. Reading level 5/6/7.

"Guerreros, Dioses y Espiritus" Outstanding illustrations. Reference book on Mexican myths. 6/7 reading level.

"Lison y el Agua Dormida" (Christian Bruel, Annie Galland, Anne Bozellec)Intricate story about a girl and her very vivid imagination. Complicated sentence structure. Difficult vocabulary. Translation of a French story. Reading level 5/6/7.

"Max y Morris" (Wilhelm Bulch). Beautifully illustrated story about two german boys. The illustrations are reproductions of original edition of book, published in 1870 in Germany. Translation from German. Complicated sentence structure. Poems have difficult vocabulary. Reading level 5/6

"Palomas Sobre el Mundo." v. I and II. (Ema Godoy) Collection of stories, legends, fables and myths. Reading level 5/6.

"Primitivos Relatos Contados Otra Vez. Heroes y Mitos Amazónicos." Although the language of these stories is complicated, they are a wonderful resource for any classroom.

"Ratatatam" (Binette Schroeder, Peter Nickl) - Beautifully illustrated story about a small locomotive and a little boy. Complicated sentence structure and vocabulary. Translation of a Swiss story. Reading level 5/6.

"Sirenita Cincuenta y Nueve." (Graciela Gonzalez de Tapia) - Beautifully illustrated Mexican tale about an adventure with a siren. Complicated sentence structure. Difficult vocabulary. Reading level 5/6

"Versos Tradicionales para Cebollitas." (Maria Elena Walsh) Wonderful collection of Argentinian folkloric poems. Reading level 5th/6th grade.

3rd and 4th grade

"Colección Cuentos Populares". Spanish translation of some very well known stories, and some unusual stories. Good vocabulary. Reading level 3/4. Some titles:
"Caperucita Roja"
"Los Tres Deseos"
"El Sastrecillo Valiente"
"La Hormiguita que Iba a Jerusalén"
"El Califa Cigüeña"

"Juanote y las Tres Bolsas de Or" (Adaptación de Jordi Jané) Lovely Catalan story about a boy trying to become very wise. Easy language structure. Reading level 3/4

"La Abeja Aragana" (Horacio Quiroga) Beautiful story by the mexican writer. easy language. 3/4 gr. reading level.

"Palomita de la Puna."
"Tutu Maramba."
"Un Chimpance."
"La Foca Loca." (Maria Elena Walsh) Four wonderfully imaginative books of poetry for young children. Easy vocabulary, fun reading. 3/4th grade reading level.
"Mientras Tim juega en el puerto" (Eduard Delgado, Francesc Rovira) Beautifully illustrated Spanish tale about a little boy and his adventures in the sea. Easy sentence structure and vocabulary. Reading level 3/4.

"Zoo Loco." (Maria Elena Walsh) Very funny book of limericks for young children.This book should be read to 2nd and 3rd graders. Reading level 3rd/4th grade.

"Preguntario". (Jairo Anibal Niño) Poemario para niños.

Science/ Social studies

Colección Piñata. This series incorporates native Hispanic leyends and illustrations to explain different concepts. Very easy reading. Big print. Reading level 2/3. Books in this collection:
Serie "El medio ambiente":
"El Agua"
"El Mar"
"El Universo"
Serie "La Flora"
"Las Frutas"
"El Maiz"
Serie"Las Artes"
"Sonidos y Ritmos""
"Los Titeres"
Serie "Las Materias Primas"
"El Barro"
"La Lana"
"El Papel"
"La Seda"
"Tres Colorantes Prehispánicos"
"El Azúcar"
"El Chocolate"
Serie "La Vida Social"
"El Campo y la Ciudad"
"El Mercado"
Serie "Cuentos y Leyendas"
"Adivinanzas Indígenas"

Serie "Nuestro Pais"
"La Zona del Silencio"

Kgn.. 1st/2nd grade

"Castillos de arena"
"El escondite"
"El hada Dalia"
"El huerto de Dona Rosa"
"La noche mas oscura del mundo"
"La orquesta" "Luisa y el arco iris"
"Pedro aprende a nadar" (Sara Gerson) Stories by the Mexican author. Very easy reading, easy vocabulary, big print. Kgn, 1/2nd grade.

"El agua y sus maravillas" Wonderful collection of science books for young children. Reading level 1/2/3. Some of the titles:
"El mar y sus maravillas"
"El maravilloso mundo""El mundo de los arboles"
"El mundo del sonido"
"La vida de los animales"
"Las islas y sus maravillas"
"Las vidas de las plantas"
"Los rios y sus maravillas"
"Migraciones animales"
"Montanas y volcanes"

"El gato araña"
"El gato cangrejo"
"El gato elefante"
"El gato Loro"
"El gato oso polar" (Nicola Bayley) Wonderful books about imaginative cat who dreams about how life would be if he were another animal. Reading level 1/2

"El mejor novio del mundo"(Adaptación de Jose Sennell) Spanish version of a chinese folktale. Wonderfull illustrations. Easy language. Reading level 1/2.

"Un pasito y otro pasito" (Tomie de Paola) Charming story. Easy language. Big print. Ideal for beginning readers. Reading level 1/2

Colección "Los Traviesos" (Rose Impey) Translation from a British series. Funny. Very easy readers. Large print. Titles:
"El Monstruo del Cepillo de Dientes"
"El terror de la Casa"
"La fiera que Nunca Duerme"
"La reina de las Alubias"
"Un tipo Duro"

Science:

El Primer Libro de la Naturaleza. (The First Book of Nature)
This wonderful series of science books brings some very complicated concepts to the level of very young children. The language is very simple, sentence structure is on the level of the early elementary grades. The illustrations are beautiful. These are books that turn young readers on to science.
"El Agua" (The water)
"El Aire" (The Air)
"El Hormiguero" (The anthill)
"El Mosquito" (The fly)

"El Sapo" (The Frog)
"La Tierra" (The earth)

Enciclopedia de la naturaleza. Lovely series of science books for young children, in the early elementary grades. The language is easy, the illustrations are beautiful, and the concepts are easy to understand. Reading level 1/2. Great addition to a classroom library.

"Como son las Mariposas" (All about butterflies)
"Como son los arboles" (All about trees)
"Como son los Dinosaurios"(All about dinosaurs)
"Como son los Monos" (All about monkeys)

Santillana
Vendor # SAN 108. Contract # 6276400

1/2/3/4

"El Zoo Fantastico" Beautiful set of easy reading books for early grades, dealing with imaginary animals. Beautiful illustrations

"Benjamin Informacion" Set A, Set B, Set C. Excellent science resource sets. 2/3/4 reading level. An important addition to the library.

"Libros para jugar" Very easy collection of reading books. Reading level 1/2 Some of the titles:
"Cincuenta salva a un amigo"
"Cincuenta y el zorro"
"El elicoptero"
"El mejor de los perros"
"Era un Rey de cuento y otras rimas insfantiles"
"Mi abuelo y el volcan Rosa"
"Yo subia la escalera y otrras rimas infantiles"

"Catalina Albóndiga y Enrique Bribón" Nice and funny story. Language is simple.. Reading level 3/4

"El Mas Pequeño del Bosque" (Alfredo Castellon) Easy story about a dwarf. Illustrated by young children. Reading level 2/3

"Olga da Polga" Series of stories about a guinea pig who is also an actress. Translated from the French. Reading level 3/4/5

Attanasio & Associates
Vendor No. ATT0280
Contract No. 6298400
"Spanish Big Books." Funny and easy reading for early childhood grades. Each book is a complete story. Wonderful to develop language. Some titles:
"Abuelito, abuelito"
"Ahora No"
"Alto"
"Buenas Noches"
"Casas"
"Dragolia"
"Hugo"
"La Cena"
"La Familia de los Tigres"
"La Fiesta"

"La Rosa Hermosa"
"La Señora Lavandera"
"Los Animales de Don Vicencio"
"Ni por aquí ni por allá"
"Quién será mi mamá?
"Rosa y Gaston"
"Ven a Jugar"

Lectorum
Vendor No. LEC 00500
Contract No. 6247300

"Colección Imágenes y Palabras." Great books to develop language. Books in the set:

"Cosas que se Mueven"
"El Libro de la Naturaleza"
"La Vueltas al Mundo"
"Viajando por el Tiempo"

'Libros para Mirar" .
"Alegre y Triste"
"Contrarios"
"Grande y Pequeño"
"La Ropa que me Gusta"
"Primeras Palabras" All these books are great for Kgn. and 1st. grade children. They have very few words, and teachers can develop a lot of vocabulary with the illustrations

"Federico Garcia Lorca y los niños." Excellent autobiography of the poet, written specifically for children, including some of his most beautiful poems.

"Cristobal Colón."
"Alejandro Magno." Interesting biographies.

1/2/3/4 grade

"Por el mar de las Antillas" Nicolas Guillen. Wonderful poems for children.

El Libro de las Adivinanzas. Collecction of riddles. Excellent for developing language.

"El Mejor Regalo" Charming story. 3/4 reading level

"El Secuestro de la Bibliotecaria" Funny story. Difficult vocabulary and sentence structure. 3/4 reading level.

"El Otoño"
"El invierno"
"La primavera"
"El verano"
"El tigre"
"El panda"
"La nutria." Exciting colection of science/literature books. Children find the information fascinating and the illustrations are outstanding.

"Representación Navideña." Good story for the Christmas holidays. Easy language.

"Sapo y Sepo Son Amigos" (Arnold Lobel) translation from English. Great story, and the first book in a series of stories about Sapo and Sepo. Excellent content. Easy language and sentence structure. Reading level 2/3.

"Viajo en Barco"
"Viajo en Avión"
"Viajo en Coche" Easy vocabulary, great illustrations. Information about transportation.

"El Sapo Distraido." Outstanding illustrations. Easy reading.

DDL BOOKS
6521 N.W. 87th Street
Miami, Florida, 33166

Vendor No. DDL 006 **Contract No. 6220500**

Colección "El Niño Quiere Saber." Excellent collection of books that combines science with reading. For elementary grades 3-6.

Colección "Punto Infantil." Very good books for early childhood.

Colección "Ventana Mágica." Clasic stories translasted into Spanish.

Colección "La Ciencia al Alcance de los Niños." Excellent science books. gr. 3-6.

"Antologia Comunicativa." Levels 1-7. Wonderful antologies of Spanish and Latin American literature for children. Every level deals with appropriate literature.

"Teatro para niños" Series of Spanish plays appropriate for elementary school levels.

Date Section Completed:_____

SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

Section 1 contains descriptive information on this project. Please complete items 1-9.

1. Grant number: 1 37601

2. Type of project (check one):

   Transitional Bilingual Education _____
   Special Alternative _____
   Developmental ✓
   Special Populations _____

3. Years of project under this Title VII grant: 1 2 3 (4) 5

4. Name of project: Dual Language Program - PS84

5. School district: 3

   Address: 32 W 92nd St
   N.Y. N.Y. 10025

6. Project director: Ruth Swinney

7. Phone number: (212) 678 2938

8. Title VII grant award to nearest dollar amount in current fiscal year: $178,124

9. Amount of Title VII support expended for evaluation in current fiscal year: $5,500

Date Section Completed:_____

SECTION 2: DISTRICT AND SCHOOL INFORMATION

Directions for Section 2-a: District Information.

Section 2-a contains information on district demographics. The information requested in questions 1-4 is required by the Title VII legislation.

1. Number of all children enrolled in programs conducted by the LEA (i.e., total public school enrollment) [7021(c)(2)(A)]:
   Number of children _____
   Date data collected _____

2. Number of limited English proficient (LEP) children enrolled in public and private schools in the district [7021(c)(2)(C)(i)]:

	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
Number of LEP children	2,600	—
Date data collected		

3. Method used to determine the number of limited English proficient children enrolled in public and private schools [Leg. Sec. 7021(c)(2)(C)(ii)]:

   PUBLIC: LAB Test

   PRIVATE: _____

4. The number of children who are receiving instruction through this Title VII project [7021(c)(2)(F)]:

   Limited English Proficient (LEP) _____
   Language Minority English Proficient (EP) _____
   English Language Background English Proficient (EP) _____

Directions for Section 2-b: School Information.

Section 2-b contains information on school demographics for those schools that participate in this Title VII project. This information should be provided to describe your project accurately. Please fill out a separate form for each school in your district with Title VII project students.

1. School name: P.S. 84

2. Type of geographic area:

Rural	
Suburban	X
Urban	

3. Number of children in the school: 637

4. Student racial/ethnic distribution (in percents):

American Indian or Alaskan Native (e.g., Eskimo, Aleut)	0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.45%
Hispanic	54.31%
Black, other than Hispanic	32.96%
White, other than Hispanic	9.26%
TOTAL	100%

5. Percent of student population from low income families: 69%

Definition of low income (check all that apply):	
School lunch program	X
Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)	X
Other	

6. Number of limited English proficient children enrolled: _____

7. Number of children who are receiving instruction through this Title VII project:

Limited English Proficient (LEP)	125
Language Minority EP	51
English Language Background EP	70

Directions for Section 2-b: School Information.

Section 2-b contains information on school demographics for those schools that participate in this Title VII project. This information should be provided to describe your project accurately. Please fill out a separate form for each school in your district with Title VII project students.

1. School name: Dual Language Middle School

2. Type of geographic area:

Rural	
Suburban	
Urban	X

3. Number of children in the school: 139

4. Student racial/ethnic distribution (in percents):

American Indian or Alaskan Native (e.g., Eskimo, Aleut)	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0
Hispanic	99
Black, other than Hispanic	1
White, other than Hispanic	0
TOTAL	100%

5. Percent of student population from low income families: 98%

Definition of low income (check all that apply):

School lunch program	x
Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)	X
Other	x

6. Number of limited English proficient children enrolled: 43

7. Number of children who are receiving instruction through this Title VII project:

Limited English Proficient (LEP)	43
Language Minority EP	87
English Language Background EP	9

Date Section Completed: _____

SECTION 3: STUDENT SELECTION INFORMATION

Section 3 contains information regarding selection of Limited English Proficient (LEP) and English Proficient (EP) students for participation in this Title VII developmental program.

Requirements:

1. The Secretary reviews applications based, in part, on the extent to which the applicant has identified the needs of the LEP students to be served in the program, including the lack o proficiency of the LEP children in speaking, writing, and understanding the English language; and the degree of proficiency of the LEP children in their native language and in other courses or subjects of study [Reg. Sec. 501.31 (a)(1)(i)-(ii)].

2. Reliability and objectivity of the method used to identify needs of the LEP students to be served in the program [Reg. Sec. 501.31(a)(2)].

Directions for Worksheet 3.1: LEP and EP Student Selection Procedures. Check the appropriate space(s) to indicate which assessment procedure(s) were used to determine selection into the Title VII developmental project for LEP and EP students. Only check selection criteria that are employed by your project.

Worksheet 3.1
LEP and EP Student Selection Procedures

Selection Procedures / Instruments	STUDENT CATEGORY LEP	STUDENT CATEGORY EP
a. Home Language Survey	X	X
b. English language proficiency		
(1) Oral	X	
(2) Reading	X	
(3) Writing		
c. Native (non-English) language proficiency		
(1) Oral		
(2) Reading		
(3) Writing		
d. Academic Achievement in English in math, science or social studies		
e. Academic achievement in a non-English language in math, science or social studies		
f. Teacher recommendations	X	X
g. Parent recommendation	X	X
h. Other: _____		

Staff Information Tables

Directions for Tables 4.1-4.13. Use Worksheet 4.1 -- Staff Information, found in the Data Collection Plan -- to fill in Tables 4.1 through 4.6. Use Worksheet 4.2 -- Staff Training, also found in the Data Collection Plan -- to fill in Tables 4.7 to 4.10. Use the teacher questionnaire found in Appendix A to fill in Tables 4.11 - 4.13.

For this section include the following staff only: Site administrators, all staff paid with Title VII funds, all teachers who work with Title VII students and staff other than teachers who work with Title VII students at least 50 percent of the time.

Directions for Table 4.1: Time on Title VII Project for Title VII Funded Staff. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrator, teacher), please indicate the total FTEs of staff whose salaries are funded by Title VII, and the actual number of such staff.

Paraprofessional Staff includes aides and tutors. "Other" refers to professional support staff including school psychologists, counselors, instructional specialists, community liaisons, computer technicians, material developers, and resource teachers.

Table 4.1
Time on Title VII Project for Title VII Funded Staff

Time Commitment and Number of Staff	Title VII Funded			
	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. FTEs	1.0	Ø	N/A	1.0
2. Number of Staff	2	Ø	N/A	2

Please check staff listed in "Other" category.

1 Community Liaisons

___ Computer Technicians

___ Counselors

___ Instructional Specialist

___ Material developers

___ School psychologists

___ Resource teachers

1 Other PROJECT SECRETARY

Directions for Table 4.2: Time on Title VII Project for Non-Title VII Funded Staff. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrator, teacher), please indicate the total FTEs of staff whose salaries are not funded by Title VII, and the actual number of such staff.

Paraprofessional Staff includes aides and tutors. "Other" refers to professional support staff such as school psychologists, counselors, instructional specialists, community liaisons, computer technicians, material developers, and resource teachers.

Table 4.2
Time on Title VII Project for Non-Title VII Funded Staff

Time Commitment and Number of Staff	Title VII Funded			
	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. FTEs	Ø	20	N/A	9
2. Number of Staff	Ø	20	N/A	9

Please check staff listed in "Other" category.

1 Community Liaisons

__ Computer Technicians

3 Counselors

1 Instructional Specialist

__ Material developers

1 School psychologists

2 Resource teachers

1 Other LIBRARIAN

Directions for Table 4.3: Percent of Salary Paid by Title VII Project. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrator, teacher), please indicate the number of staff paid by Title VII at different percentages of time.

Paraprofessional Staff includes aides and tutors. "Other" refers to professional support staff such as school psychologists, counselors, instructional specialists, community liaisons, computer technicians, material developers, and resource teachers.

Table 4.3
Percent of Salary Paid by Title VII Project

Percent of Salary Paid by Title VII	STAFF			
	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. Salary paid full time by Title VII	2	Ø	Ø	2
2. Salary paid at least half time but not full time by Title VII				
3. Salary paid less than half time by Title VII Project but more than zero				
4. Salary not paid at all by Title VII Project	2	20	N/A	9

Please check staff listed in "Other category.

3 Community Liaisons

__ Computer Technicians

3 Counselors

1 Instructional Specialist

__ Material developers

1 School psychologists

2 Resource teachers

2 Other LIBRARIAN, PROJECT SECRETARY

Directions for Table 4.4: Proficiency in Students' Native Language. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrator, teacher), indicate the number of staff with the following levels of proficiency in the native (non-English) languages of the students:

(1) Native Speakers

(2) No Proficiency: For non-native speakers, unable to speak, read, or write in student's native language;

(3) Communicative Proficiency: For non-native speakers, basic ability to communicate and interact socially in student's native language;

(4) Teaching Proficiency: For non-native speakers, ability to use LEP student's native language in teaching language arts or other academic subjects.

For each staff member indicate the highest level of proficiency only.

Table 4.4
Staff* Proficiency in Students' Native Language

Proficiency in Students' Native Language	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. Native Speaker	2	19		
2. No Proficiency				1
3. Communicative Proficiency				2
4. Teaching Proficiency				

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.5: Proficiency in English. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrator, teacher), indicate the number of:

(1) Native Speakers

Then indicate the number of non-native English speaking staff with the following levels of English proficiency:

(2) No Proficiency: Unable to speak, read, or write in English.

(3) Communicative Proficiency: Basic ability to communicate and interact socially in English,

(4) Teaching Proficiency: Able to use English in teaching language arts or other academic subjects.

For each staff member indicate the highest level of proficiency only.

Table 4.5
Staff* Proficiency in English

Proficiency in English	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. Native English Speaker				3
Non-native English Speaker 2. No Proficiency				
3. Communicative Proficiency				
4. Teaching Proficiency	2	19		

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.6: Years Teaching Experience. For teachers and aides in the Title VII project, indicate total years of teaching experience (not necessarily with LEP students). Of this total, indicate number of years of experience with LEP students.

Table 4.6
Staff* Years of Teaching Experience

Number of Years Teaching Experience	Number of Staff with General Teaching Experience		Number of Staff Having Taught LEP Students	
	Teachers	Aids	Teachers	Aides
1. 1 to 3 years	6		6	
2. 4 to 6 years	13		13	
3. 7 to 10 years				
4. 11+ years	3		3	

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.7: Professional Certification. Enter number of staff in the Title VII project with the following certificates or endorsements: paraprofessional, classroom teacher, administrative, bilingual, ESL, other. You may enter more than one certificate or endorsement for each staff member if he or she has multiple certificates/endorsements.

Table 4.7
Staff* Professional Certification

Certificate or Endorsement	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. Paraprofessional Certificate or Endorsement				
2. Teaching Certificate or Endorsement (i.e., Elementary or Secondary)		1		
3. Administrative Certificate or Endorsement	2			
4. Bilingual Certificate or Endorsement		19		
5. ESL Certificate or Endorsement				
6. Other (Specify) _____ _____				

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.8: Academic Preparation. For each category of staff working with Title VII students (e.g., administrators, teachers), indicate the number of staff with the following degrees: High School Diploma, Associate Degree, Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree, Doctoral or Professional Degree, Report highest degree only for each staff member.

Table 4.8
Staff* Academic Preparation

Degree	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional Staff	Other
1. High School Diploma				1
2. Associate Degree				1
3. Bachelor's Degree				
4. Master's Degree	2	14		
5. Doctoral or Professional Degree		11		

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.9: State or Local Certification of Endorsements. Place a check in the appropriate space if your state, district, or other lawful authority provides bilingual or ESL certificates or endorsements.

Table 4.9
State or Local Certification or Endorsements

	Certificate	Endorsement
1. Bilingual	19	
2. ESL		

Directions for Table 4.10: Staff Training. Enter number of staff in the Title VII project with the areas of training indicated.

Table 4.10
Staff* Training

Training/Experience	Administrators	Teachers	Paraprofessional	Other
1. Instruction to be proficient in the native language of students	2	20		
2. Instruction to be proficient in English (non-Native English speakers only)	2	20		
3. Linguistics (e.g., Applied Linguistics, Sociolinguistics)	2	20		
4. Cross-Cultural Communication or Cultural Awareness	2	20		
5. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in Native Language of Students	2	20		
6. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in English	2	20		
7. Educational Assessment	2	20		
8. Education Research Design and Methods (including Program Evaluation)	2	20		
9. Other Training	2	20		
10. Peace Corps				
11. Travel	2	20		
12. Other Experience	2	20		

* All staff working with Title VII students regardless of funding source.

Directions for Table 4.11: Ability to use Training in Classroom by Type of Training. Under number of staff, indicate total number of staff with training in each of the three types listed: College coursework, inservice workshops and other. Then for each category, enter number of staff at each ability level.

The information required to complete Tables 4.11-4.13 can be found int the Staff Questionnaire.

NOT PROVIDED

N/A

Table 4.11
Ability to Use Training in Classroom by Types of Training

Types of Training	Number of Staff	Ability to Use Training in Classroom			
		0	1	2	3
College Coursework					
Inservice Workshops					
Other					

Directions for Table 4.12: Ability to use Training in Classroom by Area of Training. Under number of staff, indicate total number of staff with training in each of the areas listed. Then for each area of training, enter number of staff at each ability level.

Table 4.12
Ability to Use Training in Classroom by Areas of Training

N/A

Types of Training	Number of Staff	Ability to Use Training in Classroom			
		0	1	2	3
1. Instruction to be proficient in the native language of students					
2. Instruction to be proficient in English (non-Native English speakers only)					
3. Linguistics (e.g., Applied Linguistics, Sociolinguistics)					
4. Cross-Cultural Communication or Cultural Awareness					
5. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in Native Language of Students					
6. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in English					
7. Educational Assessment					
8. Education Research Design and Methods (including Program Evaluation)					
9. Other					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Table 4.13: Type of Training by Area of Training. Under number of staff, indicate total number of staff with training in each of the areas listed. Then for each area of training, enter number of staff with each type of training.

Table 4.13
Type of Training by Area of Training

Area of Training	Number of Staff	Type of Training		
		College Coursework	Inservice Workshop	Other
1. Instruction to be proficient in the native language of students	22		✓	
2. Instruction to be proficient in English (non-Native English speakers only)	22		✓	
3. Linguistics (e.g., Applied Linguistics, Sociolinguistics)	22		✓	
4. Cross-Cultural Communication or Cultural Awareness	22		✓	
5. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in Native Language of Students	22		✓	
6. Instructional Methodology or Curricula in English	22		✓	
7. Educational Assessment	22		✓	
8. Education Research Design and Methods (including Program Evaluation)	22		✓	
9. Other	22		✓	

Section 5: Instructional Program Information

Instructional Program Information Tables

Please note that if you have completed Worksheet 5.1 in the Data Collection Plan, you will not need to complete Tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 in the data Summary Plan. Worksheet 5.1 already summarizes program information.

Directions for Tables 5.1. Average Percent Instructional Time by Language and Subject Area for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students. Table 51. shows the average percent instruction by language for each grade averaged across all instructional groups and schools. Indicate average instruction per typical full school week.

In order to complete Table 5.1, refer to Worksheet 5.2 of the Data Collection Plan. The average percent entered in Table 5.1 will be weighted by the number of students in each of the instructional groups appearing in Worksheet 5.1. To calculate a weighted average for percent instruction per typical school week through English for all instructional groups in a given grade for given subject area, refer to Worksheet 5.2 and

1) Multiply the number of students in an instructional group by the percent instruction through the English language;

2) Sum the products of Step 1 for all instructional groups in a given grade;

3) Divide the sum from Step 2 by the total number of students in this grade to get the weighted average.

Repeat these calculations to arrive at (1) the weighted average percent instruction through the native (non-English language, and (2) the weighted average percent regular classroom instruction. An example is provided on page 13.

Grade Level: K – 4

Table 5.1
Average Percent Instructional Time by
Language and Subject Area for Limited English
Proficient (LEP) Students

SUBJECT AREAS	INSTRUCTION DESIGNED		REGULAR CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION
	Through English	Through The Native Language	
Reading	50%	50%	100%
English Language Arts	50%	50%	100%
Native (non- English) Language Arts	50%	50%	100%
Math	50%	50%	100%
Social/Studies	50%	50%	100%
Science	50%	50%	100
Average Percent	50%	50%	[illegible]

Section 5: Instructional Program Information

Instructional Program Information Tables

Please note that if you have completed Worksheet 5.1 in the Data Collection Plan, you will not need to complete Tables 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 in the data Summary Plan. Worksheet 5.1 already summarizes program information.

Directions for Tables 5.1. Average Percent Instructional Time by Language and Subject Area for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students. Table 51. shows the average percent instruction by language for each grade averaged across all instructional groups and schools. Indicate average instruction per typical full school week.

In order to complete Table 5.1, refer to Worksheet 5.2 of the Data Collection Plan. The average percent entered in Table 5.1 will be weighted by the number of students in each of the instructional groups appearing in Worksheet 5.1. To calculate a weighted average for percent instruction per typical school week through English for all instructional groups in a given grade for given subject area, refer to Worksheet 5.2 and

1) Multiply the number of students in an instructional group by the percent instruction through the English language;

2) Sum the products of Step 1 for all instructional groups in a given grade;

3) Divide the sum from Step 2 by the total number of students in this grade to get the weighted average.

Repeat these calculations to arrive at (1) the weighted average percent instruction through the native (non-English language, and (2) the weighted average percent regular classroom instruction. An example is provided on page 13.

Grade Level: _____

Table 5.1
Average Percent Instructional Time by
Language and Subject Area for Limited English
Proficient (LEP) Students

SUBJECT AREAS	INSTRUCTION DESIGNED		REGULAR CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION
	Through English	Through The Native Language	
Reading	65%	35%	100
English Language Arts	65%	35%	100
Native (non- English) Language Arts	65%	35%	100
Math	65%	35%	100
Social/Studies	65%	35%	100
Science	65%	35%	100
Average Percent	65%	35%	100

In this example for Grade 5 in Math, the 63 percent shown in the column for English instruction for LEP students is derived by following these steps:

(1) Multiply the number of students in each instructional group by the percent instruction through the English language;

10 x 50 = 500
20 x 60 = 1200
30 x 70 = 2100

(2) Sum the products of Step 1;

500
1200
2100
3800

(3) Divide the sum from Step 2 by the total number of students to get the weighted average;

3800/60 = 63%

The figure 63 percent appearing on the worksheet for Table 5.1 would be carried over to Table 5.1 and entered in the "box" that corresponds to Math instruction designed for LEP students through English; 18 percent to the "box" that corresponds to math instruction designed for LEP students through the native language; and 18 percent to the "box that corresponds to math instruction in regular classroom instruction.

Grade Level: 5

Subject Area: Math

Worksheet for Table 5.1 (Sample)
Percent Instructional Time for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	INSTRUCTION DESIGNED FOR LEP STUDENTS		REGULAR CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION
		Through English	Through The Native Language	
Group 1	10	50%	40%	10%
Group 2	20	60%	20%	20%
Group 3	30	70%	10%	20%
Group 4				
Group 5				
Group 6				
Average Percent	XXXXXXX	63%	18%	18%

Directions for Table 5.2: Average percent Instruction by Language and Subject Area for English Proficient (EP) Students. Table 5.2 shows the percent instruction by language for each grade averaged across all instructional groups and schools. Indicate percent instruction per typical full school week.

In order to complete 5.2, refer to Worksheet 5.3 of the Data Collection Plan. The average percent entered in Table 5.2 will be weighted by the number of students in each instructional group appearing in Worksheet 5.3. To calculate the weighted average percent instruction per typical school week through English for all instructional groups in a given grade for a given subject area, refer to Worksheet 5.3 and

1) Multiply the number of students in each instructional group by the percent instruction through English;

2) Sum the products of Step 1 for all instructional groups in a given grade;

3) Divide the sum from Step 2 by the total number of students in this grade to get the weighted average.

Repeat these calculations to arrive at the average percent instruction through the non-English Language.

Grade Level: _____

Table 5.2
Average Percent Instructional by Language and Subject Area for English Proficient (EP) Students

SUBJECT AREAS	LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION INSTRUCTION FOR EP STUDENTS	
	Through English	Through The Non-English Language
Reading		
English Language Arts		
Native (non-English) Language Arts		
Math		
Social Studies		
Science		
Average Percent		

Directions for Table 5.3: Hours Per Week Instruction by Student's Language Proficiency and Subject Area. Table 5.3 shows the number of hours per week of instruction in different subject areas for both English Proficiency (EP) and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Refer to Worksheet 5.3a in completing Table 5.3 for LEP students, and refer to Worksheet 5.3a in completing 5.3 for EP students. The hours per week entered in Table 5.3 should be the average across all instructional groups. These hours should be a weighted average depending on the number of students per instructional group, as for Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

Grade Level: _____

N/A

Table 5.3
Hours Per Week Instructional by Student's Language Proficiency and Subject Area

SUBJECT AREAS	STUDENTS LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY	
	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)	ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS (EP)
Reading		
English Language Arts		
Native (non-English) Language Arts		
Math		
Social Studies		
Science		

Section 6: Student Information and Non-Test Data

Student Information Tables

Directions for Table 6.1 - 6.4. Use Worksheet 6.1, Student Information and Non-Test Data to fill in these tables.

Directions for Table 6.1: Number of Title VII Students by Language Proficiency Level and Grade. For each grade level represented in the Title VII project, list the number of Limited-English-Proficient students, the number of English proficient students, and the total number of students. Sum across schools as necessary to compile the information for each grade.

Table 6.1
Number of Title VII Students by Language Proficiency Level and Grade

Grade	Proficiency		Total Students
	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT	ENGLISH PROFICIENT	
K	32	19	5
1	24	20	4[illegible]
2	25	[illegible]	4[illegible]
3	16	[illegible]	4
4	13	20	3[illegible]
5	16	16	3[illegible]
6	[illegible]	22	4[illegible]
7	[illegible]	33	[illegible]
8	[illegible]	25	3[illegible]

Directions for Table 6.2: Number of Title VII Students Eligible for Free Lunch by Grade. For each grade level represented in the project, list the total number of limited English Proficient students and English proficient students who are eligible for free lunch. In the last column indicate the total number of students eligible for free lunch. Sum across schools as necessary to compile the information for each grade.

Table 6.2
Number of Title VII Students Eligible for Free Lunch by Grade

Grade	Proficiency		Total Students
	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT	ENGLISH PROFICIENT	
K	32	10	42
1	21	14	35
2	20	10	30
3	14	16	30
4	13	11	24
5	15	7	22
6	20	22	42
7	13	33	46
8	13	25	38

Directions for Table 6.3: Number of Title VII Students by Language Proficiency Level and Language Group. For each language group represented in the project (besides English Language Background Students) list the number of Limited-English Proficient students, the number of English proficient students and the total number of students. Sum across project grades and schools as necessary to compile the information for each language group.

Table 6.3
Number of Title VII Students by Language Proficiency Level and Language Group

N/A

Grade	Proficiency		Total Students
	LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT	ENGLISH PROFICIENT	

Directions for Table 6.4: Non-Test Data Summary for Project Students. Use Worksheet 6.1 to complete this table.

The Column numbers for the table correspond to the column numbers on the data worksheet. Transfer total numbers from Worksheet 6.1.

To Calculate a column total, sum the numbers in each column. To calculate a column average, divide the column total by the total number of project students. Multiplying the averages by 100 will give a percent.

Table 6.4: Non-Test Data Summary on Project Students

N/A

Grade	Number of Students Currently In Project	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Number of Dropouts	Number Referred and Placed In		(12) Number Enrolled in Postsecondary Education	(13) Number Participating at least 100 days	(14) Total Number of Days Attended	(15) Total Number of Days Enrolled
					(10) Special Education	(11) Gifted or Talented				
Project Total:										
Project Average:	XXXXXXX									

Date: _____

Directions for Table 6.5: Non-Test Data Summary for Comparison Students. Use Worksheet 6.2 in the Data Collection Plan to fill in this table.

This table is recommended for comparison group students. The composition of the comparison group will differ depending on which analysis you have selected.

The column numbers for the tables correspond to the column numbers on the data worksheets. Transfer total numbers from the Non-Test Data Worksheet.

To Calculate a column total, sum the numbers in each column. To calculate a column average, divide the column total by the total number of project students. Multiplying the averages by 100 will give a percent.

Table 6.5: Non-Test Data Summary for Comparison Students

N/A

Grade	Students Currently in Comparison Group	(7) Attended School Prior to Entry into Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Number of Dropouts	Number Referred and Placed In		(12) Number Enrolled in Postsecondary Education	(13) Number Participating at least 100 days	(14) Total Number of Days Attended	(15) Total Number of Days Enrolled
					(10) Special Education	(11) Gifted or Talented				
Comparison Total:										
Comparison Average:	XXXXXXX									

Date: _____

Directions for Worksheet 3.2 and 3.3: Selection Procedures and Criteria. For those selection procedures and instruments that you checked in Worksheet 3.1, provide the names of tests or procedures and selection scores or criteria for project entry. Also provide the type of score or unit (raw score, percentile, standard score, etc.) if applicable. Worksheet 3.2 is for LEP students. Worksheet 3.3 is for EP students.

Worksheet 3.2
Selection Procedures and Criteria for LEP Students

Test or Procedure	Selection Scores or Criteria	Type of Score or Unit (If applicable)
LAB	below standard score	40%

Directions for Worksheet 3.2 and 3.3: Selection Procedures and Criteria. For those selection procedures and instruments that you checked in Worksheet 3.1, provide the names of tests or procedures and selection scores or criteria for project entry. Also provide the type of score or unit (raw score, percentile, standard score, etc.) if applicable. Worksheet 3.2 is for LEP students. Worksheet 3.3 is for EP students.

Worksheet 3.3
Selection Procedures and Criteria for EP Students

Test Or Procedure	Selection Scores or Criteria	Type of Score or Unit (if applicable)
PARENT REQUEST	NA	NA

Worksheet 4.1
Staff Information

Staff I.D. #	(1) Position	(2) FTE On Project	(3) Salaries Paid by Title VII	(4) Proficiency in Student's Native (Non-English) Language	(5) Proficiency in English	(6) Years of Experience in Schools	(7) Years of School Experience with LEP Students
688687	T	1.0		NS	I	3	3
689484	T	1.0		NS	NS	[illegible]	3
690503	T	1.0		NS	[illegible]	2	[illegible]
690879	T	1.0		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
451876	A	N.A	100%	NS	NS	21	21
309397	A	N.A	0	CD	NS	30	30
478704	A	1.0	0	NS	TD	14	14
463774	A	1.0	100%	NS	IK	12	12
655196	T	1.0		[illegible]	[illegible]	4	4
663646	T	1.0		[illegible]	[illegible]	3	[illegible]
485275	T	1.0		[illegible]	[illegible]	12	[illegible]
643466	T	1.0		[illegible]	[illegible]	4	4

Note
In columns 1, 3, 4, and 5 place the appropriate letters from the preceding key.
In column 2, place the appropriate FTEs from the preceding key.
In columns 6-7, place the appropriate numbers from the preceding key.

77

78

Worksheet 4.1
Staff Information

Staff I.D. #	(1) Position	(2) FTE On Project	(3) Salaries Paid by Title VII	(4) Proficiency in Student's Native (Non-English) Language	(5) Proficiency in English	(6) Years of Experience in Schools	(7) Years of School Experience with LEP Students
448905	T	1.0	Y	NS	[illegible]	21	21
604267	T	1.0		NS	[illegible]	8	8
657609	T	1.0		NS	[illegible]	5	5
609849	T	1.0		NS	[illegible]	6	6
433396	T	1.0		NP	[illegible]	33	4
677403	T	1.0		CP	[illegible]	2	1
671315	T	1.0		NS	[illegible]	2	2
654063	T	1.0		NS	[illegible]	4	4
660819	T	1.0		[illegible]	[illegible]	3	3
642364	T	1.		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
673256	T	1.0		NS	[illegible]	2	2
654049	T	1.0		NS	[illegible]	4	4
			X				

Note
In columns 1, 3, 4, and 5 place the appropriate letters from the preceding key.
In column 2, place the appropriate FTEs from the preceding key.
In columns 6-7, place the appropriate numbers from the preceding key.

79

80

Worksheet 4.2
Staff Training

Staff I.D. #	(8) Professional Certification or Endorsement	(9) Academic Preparation	(10) MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY: AA	(11) MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY: BA	(12) MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY: MA	(13) MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY: Doctorate or Other Professional Degree	(14) Training Related To Language-Minority Education, or Other (Specify)	(15) Non-Academic Experience Related to Language Minority Education
448905	B	MA			36	40	73	
604267	B	MA			22	35	[illegible]	
657609	B	MA			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
609849	B	BA			[illegible]	[illegible]		
433396	T	MA			34	[illegible]	[illegible]	
677403	T	BA		1			61	
671315	B	BA			6	NONE	73	
654063	B	BA				[illegible]	[illegible]	
660819	B	MA					73	
642364	B	MA				[illegible]	73	
673256	T	BA		31			72	
654049	T	BA		31		[illegible]	72	

Note

In columns 8 and 9, place the appropriate letters from the preceding key.
In columns 10-15, place the appropriate numbers from the preceding key.

82

81

Worksheet 4.2
Staff Training

Staff I.D. #	(8) Professional Certification or Endorsement	(9) Academic Preparation	(10) MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY: AA	(11) MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY: BA	(12) MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY: MA	(13) MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY: Doctorate or Other Professional Degree	(14) Training Related To Language-Minority Education, or Other (Specify)	(15) Non-Academic Experience Related to Language Minority Education
6[illegible]87	T	MA						
689484	T	MA						
690503	T	BA						
690879	T	BA						
451876	A	MA			14	14		
309397	A	MA			10	64		
478704	B	MA			40	10		
463774	B	MA			[illegible]	[illegible]		
655196	[illegible]	BA			40	[illegible]		
663646	B	MA			32	35		
485275	B	MA			25	40		
643466	T	BA			9	25		

Note

In columns 8 and 9, place the appropriate letters from the preceding key.
In columns 10-15, place the appropriate numbers from the preceding key.

83

84

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Directions for Worksheet 4.3: Staff Information Addendum. In this worksheet staff refers to staff, other than teachers, who spend less than 50 percent of their time with Title VII students. Please indicate number of other staff working with Title VII students. Leave blank if not applicable.

Worksheet 4.3
Staff Information Addendum

Position	Number
School Psychologist	1
Counselor	3
Instructional Specialist	1
Community Liaison	1
Computer Technician	
Materials Developer	
Resource Teacher	2
Other LIBRARIAN	1

Date Section Completed: 12/92

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level K

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	31	50	50	
	EP	19			
Math	LEP				
	EP				
Science	LEP				
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): Language Arts (Reading, Writing)

86

87

Date Section Completed: 12/92

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 1st

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	24	50	50	
	EP	22			
Math	LEP				
	EP				
Science	LEP				
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): Language Arts (Reading, Writing)

Date Section Completed: 12/92

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 2

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	25	50	50	
	EP	19			
Math	LEP				
	EP				
Science	LEP				
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): Language Arts (Reading, Writing)

90

91

Date Section Completed: 12/92

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 3

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	16	50	50	
	EP	25			
Math	LEP				
	EP				
Science	LEP				
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): Language Arts (Reading, Writing)

Date Section Completed: 12/92

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 4

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	14	50	50	
	EP	20			
Math	LEP				
	EP				
Science	LEP				
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): Language Arts (Reading, Writing)

Date Section Completed: 12/92

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 5

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	16	50	50	
	EP	16			
Math	LEP				
	EP				
Science	LEP				
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): Language Arts (Reading, Writing)

Date Section Completed: _____

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 6

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	20	65	35	4
	EP	15			
Math	LEP				4
	EP				
Science	LEP				3
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				3
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				2
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): _____

Date Section Completed: _____

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 7

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	30	35	65	4
	EP	25			
Math	LEP				3
	EP				
Science	LEP				3
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				3
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				2
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): _____

Date Section Completed: _____

SECTION 5: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions for Worksheet 5.1: Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction. For each subject area you list, indicate for both LEP and EP students, the number of students, percent of instruction through the native (non-English) language and through English and hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Grade level 8

Worksheet 5.1
Percent and Amount of Time in Native (Non-English) and English Instruction

Subject Area		Number of Students	Percent Instruction		Hours Per Week In Each Subject
			Through Native Language	Through English	
Language Arts	LEP	20	35	65	4
	EP	25			
Math	LEP				4
	EP				
Science	LEP				3
	EP				
Social Studies	LEP				3
	EP				
Art, Music, Gym	LEP				2
	EP				
	LEP				
	EP				

Subject areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella (if applicable): _____

102 103

Directions for Worksheet 5.2: Percent Instructional Time for LEP Students. For subject areas listed below indicate percent of instructional time per typical full school week. Percent instructional time for each row (or group) should total 100 percent. Subject areas include, as appropriate to the grade level, Reading, English Language Arts, Native (non-English) Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Science. Complete a separate worksheet for each grade level and subject area across schools.

Grade Level 6TH Subject Area MATH

Subject Areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella if applicable _____

Worksheet 5.2
Percent Instructional Time for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	INSTRUCTION DESIGNED FOR LEP STUDENTS		REGULAR CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION
		THROUGH ENGLISH	THROUGH THE NATIVE LANGUAGE	
Group 1	7	100		ONLY
Group 2				
Group 3				
Group 4				
Group 5				
Group 6				

Directions for Worksheet 5.2a: Hours Per Week Instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students. Please briefly describe the basis for instructional grouping that is reported in Worksheet 5.1 (e.g., language proficiency, academic achievement level, or other) and the hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Worksheet 5.2a
Hours Per Week Instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

Basis for Grouping	Hours Per Week Spent in This Subject Area For Each Group
Group 1: BY ABILITY	5
Group 2:	
Group 3:	
Group 4:	
Group 5:	
Group 6:	

107

106

Directions for Worksheet 5.3: Percent Instructional Time for English Proficient Students. For each subject area indicate percent of instructional time per typical full school week. Percent instructional time for each row should total 100 percent. Subject areas include as appropriate to the grade level, English Language Arts, Native (non-English) Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Sciences. Complete a separate worksheet for each grade level and subject area across schools.

Grade Level _____ Subject Area _____

Subject Areas included in inter-disciplinary umbrella if applicable _____

Worksheet 5.3
Percent Instructional Time for English Proficient (EP) Students

INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	INSTRUCTION DESIGNED FOR EP STUDENTS	
		THROUGH ENGLISH	THROUGH THE NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE
Group 1		NA	
Group 2		NA	
Group 3		NA	
Group 4		NA	
Group 5		NA	
Group 6			

108

109

Directions for Worksheet 5.3a: Hours Per Week Instruction For English Proficient (EP) Students. Please briefly describe the basis for instructional grouping that is reported in Worksheet 5.1 (e.g., language proficiency, academic achievement level, or other) and the hours per week of instruction in that subject area.

Worksheet 5.3a
Hours Per Week Instruction for English Proficient (EP) Students

Basis for Grouping		Hours Per Week Spent in This Subject Area For Each Group
Group 1:	NA	
Group 2:	NA	
Group 3:		
Group 4:		
Group 5:		
Group 6:		

Directions for Worksheet 5.4: Instructional Program Information. For each subject area reported in Worksheet 5.1 or 5.2 and 5.3, describe pedagogical activities and materials. For those projects that used Worksheets 5.2 and 5.3 please describe instructional features and materials for all groups within each project grade level. However, report separate information for groups shown on Worksheet 5.2 and 5.3 only when activities and materials are different for each group. Be as brief as possible. Consult with lead teachers as necessary to complete this worksheet. Appendix B lists and defines a number instructional approaches. Projects may wish to draw upon these approaches in describing their own instructional activities, if applicable. Since not all possible instructional approaches are contained in this list, projects should list and define any other approaches being used.

Worksheet 5.4
Pedagogical Method & Techniques Information

Date: 4/21/93

Grade Level: K-7

Subject Area: _____

Instructional Group (if applicable): _____

SEE ATTACHED INFORMATION

District 3 Developmental Title VII Project
Dual Language Program -P.S. 84/ Dual Language Middle School

Instructional Program Information for LEP and EP students

English Language Arts
Grades K-4
Activities
In the early childhood grades curriculum areas are be integrated, and children are exposed to an array of experiences specifically designed to develop rich language; techniques such as the following are used to encourage complex English language development: oral repetition, listening to the teacher and to other good language role models, listening to dialogues and stories, dialogue practice, singing songs, reading and writing, using The Writing Process, memorizing dialogues/plays/poems, reading trade books and magazines, doing hands on projects and participating in experiments in the areas of science, math and art.

Grades 5-7
Activities
Emphasis is given to the development of communicative skills in English. Writing workshops are offered where children polish, edit and publish their writing. Research projects develop skills in the appropriate use of advanced level reference materials such as readers, guides, directories and abstracts.

The reading program is centered around reading classic literary works, the organization of reading clubs, and the development of committees to review and recommend books to the groups. Language skills such as listening comprehension, reading for information, speaking for oral presentations, writing for reports are developed through the reading clubs, in which students read both fiction and non fiction books related to their social studies curriculum.

Students produce a monthly Student Newsletter, publishing stories, news of the program, and reviews of movies and television shows. Poetry and drama workshops allow students to view classic plays and movies, and act as critics, writing reviews for the student newsletter.

Both content and language teaching are formally incorporated into the instructional approach. Students are taught specific language required for different subjects as quickly as possible.

Spanish Language Arts

Grades K-4
Activities
Children have ample opportunities for oral language development. Curriculum in the Spanish content areas is specifically designed to

develop communicative skills, such as listening, speaking, reading and writing.

Reading is taught using the Whole Language approach, using the language and experience that children bring to school, to develop reading skills. On-going diagnosis and prescription assures individualization of the reading program.

Grades 5-7
Activities
Students are involved in age appropriate research projects in the subject areas such as social studies and science, which are specifically designed to develop communicative skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing, as well as academic Spanish language skills.

To develop reading skills in Spanish, students are involved in individualized as well as in group activities, such as reading clubs, where they read Spanish and Latin American literature, analyze the writings and gain insights into their own culture and heritage.

Social Studies, Math and Science

Grades K-4
Social Studies -Activities
The activities for social studies follow those recommended by the New York City curriculum guides with the added dimension of various activities related to culture. Pupils are given the opportunity to explore their own culture as well as to understand the majority culture. Community resources and agencies are used to augment the efforts of the project staff.

Cultural and ethnic studies emphasize pupil's experiences through classroom, school, and community activities. Through specific projects students learn to look up information, to organize information to use dictionaries and encyclopedias.

Math -Activities
The activities for mathematics are based in the New York's City curriculum. The math program focuses on the relationship of math with other curriculum areas. Through individualized activities children are exposed to the language of math and have an opportunity to work with some of its tools.

Instruction in mathematics emphasizes creative thinking and problem solving, logical thinking and affective processes such as appreciating and valuing, and the development and understanding of mathematical skills that go beyond arithmetic.

Science -Activities
Science curriculum is taught through an individualized project oriented approach, utilizing extensive use of visuals, manipulatives, and concrete experiences to stimulate oral language in a spontaneous way. There is extensive use of community resources, such as the Museum of Natural History, where children are involved in learning about the environment, using activities such as classification, comparison and exploration. Science is integrated with the other curriculum areas, through projects specifically designed to help students develop an understanding of the interrelationship between the different disciplines.

Grades 5-7

Social Studies -Activities
The social studies program emphasizes the teaching of concepts, rather than the accumulation of data, focusing on the development of critical thinking. In group as well as individual projects, students are asked to think as scholars - to search out and deal with authentic source materials, to use techniques of inquiry and discovery, and finally, to arrive at conclusions supported by evidence.

The program incorporates into the curriculum basic concepts drawn from the disciplines of history and the social sciences, and through projects develops skills and research techniques sequentially.

Learning activities are designed to aim at conceptualization through techniques of inquiry and discovery. The sixth graders, for example, are studying the history of the United States and it's relationship with Canada. The curriculum comes alive as they take an imaginary trip through the maritime provinces. Budgeting, spending money on food, sight seeing and buying souvenirs are part of the traveling experience, as children learn to make decisions, and to accept choices. They maintain a diary which enables them to see where they have come from and where they are going.

The use of globes, maps and Atlases allow the children to trace their trip, to discuss geographical changes and to project other trips as well.

Math-Activities
Math is taught to develop an understanding of the connections between this science, and all other areas of the curriculum, and to foster the love for this subject.

The math program is developed to show how vital "math" is to everyday life. Through different activities groups of children are exposed to the language of math and have an opportunity to work with some of its tools.

Square design work, for example, allows the children time to experience area, patterns, congruency, shape recognition and the metric system. They are able to look at their creations and see which designs are symmetrical, which polygons are used in their designs and note the congruency when their squares are placed on the graph paper.

Words such as symmetry, rotation, and revolution become real to the children involved in math art club. Activities such as the construction of a straw suspension bridge help students understand why the triangle is used in construction and how the cables of a suspension bridge form a parabola. These as well as other projects give children an opportunity to better understand the language of math.

The use of computers stresses the integration of math into the other curriculum areas such as science, language arts, and social studies, through programs such as "Travel to Oregon," which strengthen student's learning skills, particularly note taking, strategic thinking, decision making, and manipulation of real-life data.

Continuous exposure to programs such as LOGO "Turtle Geometry" develop complex geometrical concepts such as angles, rotations, distances, coordinates, in meaningful ways. Other programs such as "Problem Solving Strategies" direct the children to collect, organize and analyze data and discover patterns for solving classic geometric problems.

Math is taught to develop an understanding of the connections between this science, and all other areas of the curriculum, and to foster the love for this subject.

Science -Activities

The goal of the science program is to develop scientific literate students, who understand how science, technology and society influence one another, and who are able to use this knowledge in their everyday decision making.

The science program provides ample opportunities for the sequential development of basic physical and life science concepts, along with the development of science process and inquiry skills, through individualized projects, trips to the Bronx Zoo, the Museum of Natural History, and trips to the local library, students do research on topics such as ecology and the impact humans are having on the global environment.

Science instruction is used to integrate, reinforce and enhance the other curricular areas, through projects such as "The Voyage of the Mimi," which offers a combination of television episodes and expeditions-along with computer software , work sheets and opportunities for hands-on investigations, to help children understand how the scientific process works.

Science concepts are reinforced through "clubs" and "workshops" in the afternoons, such as "Exploring Inner Space," which offer the opportunity for learning the use and application of the compound microscope in understanding cells. In the workshops children are able to develop their own interests, and expand on the interests developed through their lessons.

Worksheet 5.4
Pedagogical Method & Techniques Information

STAFF I.D. #	PRIMARY PEDAGOGICAL METHOD USED	PRIMARY PEDAGOGICAL TECHNIQUE USED	AVERAGE PERCENT OF SCHOOL DAY SPENT ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION				
			INDIVIDUAL PLANNING	PEER CONSULTATION	TEACHING	OTHER	TOTAL
655196	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
663646	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
485275	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
643466	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
448905	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
604267	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
657609	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
609849	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
433396	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
671315	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
654063	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
478704	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
433396	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
677403	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
673256	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
654049	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
688687	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
672294	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
689484	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%

Worksheet 5.4
Pedagogical Method & Techniques Information

STAFF I.D. #	PRIMARY PEDAGOGICAL METHOD USED	PRIMARY PEDAGOGICAL TECHNIQUE USED	AVERAGE PERCENT OF SCHOOL DAY SPENT ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION				
			INDIVIDUAL PLANNING	PEER CONSULTATION	TEACHING	OTHER	TOTAL
690503	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%
690879	2	5/17	10%	10%	80%		100%

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: Kgn Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
251-028-502	03/24/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-030-896	01/27/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-316	08/07/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-324	09/07/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-033-817	12/30/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-034-740	03/21/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-381	01/08/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-035-432	12/29/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-154-635	02/04/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-449	04/02/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-456	12/30/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-035-085	09/26/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-829	10/26/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-548	08/04/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-033-619	06/12/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-029-187	03/24/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: Kgn Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): (LEP) EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SEX	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
251-033-205	01/26/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-290	06/11/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-308	01/07/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-902	08/03/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-647	10/27/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-977	11/26/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-032-231	05/09/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-043-105	11/12/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
253-192-231	01/16/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-399	11/26/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-028-577	07/01/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-042-115	06/27/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-464	03/19/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-811	10/26/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-042-222	10/18/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-712	03/19/87	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: Kgn Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
251-031-258	09/04/87	W	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-028-528	09/25/87	B	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-332	06/27/87	H/B	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-029-179	07/17/87	B	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-365	11/28/87	B	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-407	08/14/87	H	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
	02/04/87	H	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-431	05/13/87	W/A	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-029-724	01/12/87	W	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-290	06/11/87	H	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-029-195	11/07/87	B	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-340	03/25/87	W	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-032-231	05/09/87	H	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-043-105	11/12/87	H	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
253-192-231	01/16/87	H	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-028-577	07/01/87	H	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: Kgn Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
251-030-334	01/14/87	B	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-483	04/07/87	W	Eng	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-031-506	08/12/87	B	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
TOTAL														

128 129

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 1st Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
250-829-793	10/03/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-026-225	06/14/86	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-137	04/08/96	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
250-784-675	05/31/86	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-108-391	05/25/86	H	Span	N	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-165-631	02/02/86	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-041-810	12/17/86	H	Span	N	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-228	05/11/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
245-132-477	12/28/86	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
247-969-488	12/05/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-178	11/27/86	W/H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-163-776	10/04/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-145	08/23/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-164-485	12/13/86	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
243-166-634	11/12/86	H	Span	N	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-026-209	08/26/86	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 1st Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): (LEP) EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
248-180-168	08/30/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-178-865	09/12/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-026-233	07/13/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-107-443	05/21/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-097-933	09/01/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
247-985-120	08/16/86	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-041-836	11/04/86	H	Span	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
250-761-772	07/28/86	H	Span	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

132

133

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 1st Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
248-179-327	06/30/86	H	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
250-741-774	02/02/86	B	Eng	N	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-129	06/16/86	H	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
250-888-708	03/31/86	H	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-111	10/25/86	W	Eng	N	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
243-166-592	11/07/86	O/H	Eng	N	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
243-166-808	02/02/86	H	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
237-559-877	10/08/85	B	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-293	05/09/86	W/H	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-178-907	04/28/86	H	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
250-758-802	11/05/86	H	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-095	06/21/86	W/H	Eng	N	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-285	06/02/86	W	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-889	06/25/86	W	Eng	N	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
251-026-548	11/07/86	H	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
248-179-244	09/07/86	H	Eng	E	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information and Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 1st Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) [illegible]	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
243-166-584	10/08/86	B	Eng	N	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
250-784-360	01/27/86	H	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
250-855-475	11/30/86	H	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
243-166-600	12/09/86	B	Eng	E	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
TOTAL														

136

137

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 2nd Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SEX	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
245-132-170	12/02/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-311	08/02/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-060-208	08/27/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-055-497	05/01/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-134-093	01/14/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-133-145	12/30/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-134-069	04/21/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-042-933	11/09/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-287	06/21/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-133-186	09/01/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-041-844	02/18/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-134-101	05/06/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
250-900-198	01/12/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
248-182-404	10/13/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-309-269	05/20/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-220	03/27/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

138 139

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 2nd Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
243-181-179	01/06/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-781	12/24/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
231-663-535	11/18/84	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-134-051	09/21/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-972	01/24/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
248-155-566	09/06/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
248-171-498	12/25/84	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-166-980	02/05/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
247-934-284	08/02/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

140

141

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 2nd Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
245-132-212	08/26/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-840	03/01/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-337	06/15/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-123-378	06/16/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
248-182-206	05/07/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
250-855-806	09/10/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
244-917-985	02/11/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-134-010	05/09/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-238	07/10/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-029	10/21/84	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
250-894-011	04/05/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-134-028	02/12/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-026-209	10/08/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-168-135	10/28/85	H	Span	N	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-309-400	07/09/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-188	07/19/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
TOTAL														

142

143

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 2nd Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
251-035-440	08/12/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-352	03/27/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-132-451	08/01/85	H	Span	E	3	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
TOTAL														

144 145

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 3rd Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
251-028-270	08/15/83	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
236-037-065	12/17/83	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-041-802	11/01/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
249-453-887	06/03/83	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-060-216	01/17/83	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-412-188	04/25/83	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-166-220	11/18/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-028-260	11/13/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-052	08/27/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
239-010-028	05/11/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-041-794	03/17/83	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-310-275	12/05/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-219	09/27/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-167-004	05/15/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-872	08/17/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-308-790	03/14/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

146

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 3rd Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
237-493-309	03/02/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
250-900-412	04/10/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
236-254-405	04/04/83	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-282-324	11/19/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-227	08/18/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-268	08/11/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-133-236	01/17/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-310-440	04/24/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-948	09/26/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-989	10/09/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-732-089	01/03/84	H	Span	B	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
239-047-889	01/12/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-914	11/13/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-310-382	03/31/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
250-900-495	04/10/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
236-037-495	09/10/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 3rd Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
234-732-147	06/24/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
242-273-968	03/27/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-309-939	09/01/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-309-053	07/01/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-781-953	01/16/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-166-261	02/13/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-166-253	04/05/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-166-279	05/26/84	H	Span	E	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-042-065	07/19/84	H	Span	N	4	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 4th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): (LEP) EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SEX	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
251-060-109	02/04/82	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-187	07/11/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
245-263-991	04/15/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-032-538	01/01/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
231-805-904	08/22/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-166-147	03/29/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-041-851	11/18/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-690	09/30/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
248-018-160	10/10/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-252	03/14/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-489-760	01/25/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-744-415	10/08/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-310-507	10/10/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

152

153

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92-93 Grade: 4th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
241-310-341	11/03/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-310-614	02/23/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-278	08/06/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-344	07/08/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-664	08/06/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-585-591	01/26/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-161	12/26/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-179	04/10/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
236-036-836	02/10/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-433	01/27/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-310-523	08/11/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-334	07/14/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-237	05/22/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-377	10/30/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-310-721	04/05/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
236-229-035	08/03/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92-93 Grade: 4th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
237-495-841	12/31/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-656	07/03/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-797-173	07/23/83	H	Span	E	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-583-737	10/27/83	H	Span	N	5	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
TOTAL														

15[illegible] 157

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 5th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SEX	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
231-806-548	09/18/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-559	01/18/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-044-996	02/12/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-732-378	06/25/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-060-190	08/07/81	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
243-166-188	08/05/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
239-294-093	11/08/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
233-169-523	01/01/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
236-036-877	10/28/82	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-041-869	09/19/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
250-910-981	04/03/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-732-964	10/23/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
236-037-560	01/11/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-309-905	01/24/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
233-169-390	12/26/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
251-042-073	12/11/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	No	N/A	N/A			
					TOTAL									

158 159

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 5th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SEX	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
241-309-707	11/03/81	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-733-400	09/13/83	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
235-903-770	12/31/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-496-518	08/23/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-496-658	10/08/82	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
231-743-790	08/23/82	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-733-152	12/08/82	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
241-310-077	11/01/82	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-732-709	08/29/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
231-155-052	12/27/81	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
234-550-978	11/18/82	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-573	08/29/82	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
233-169-606	09/22/82	H	Span	N	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
231-803-487	01/19/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
233-169-515	08/10/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
237-497-342	11/15/82	H	Span	E	6	N/A	N	N/A	NO	N/A	N/A			
TOTAL														

160 161

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 6 Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 180 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
231-888-330	08/18/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
243-160-165	11/30/80	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
249-455-148	10/01/82	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
237-491-998	10/12/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
245-132-923	08/05/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
233-168-889	04/30/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
233-180-074	03/11/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
236-036-794	07/12/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
236-035-515	09/27/79	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
234-728-061	07/20/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
228-435-442	04/14/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
245-128-905	11/15/80	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
250-900-859	02/07/80	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
241-425-180	04/05/80	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
248-165-821	06/02/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
229-862-057	10/27/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
					TOTAL									

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information and Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92-93 Grade: 6 Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): (LEP) EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
250-914-751	06/04/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
251-048-187	02/28/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
251-061-966	07/18/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
251-051-876	07/19/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
TOTAL														

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 6 Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled 180
231-821-752	12/07/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
231-382-078	07/10/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
231-342-981	01/10/81	[illegible]	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
225-096-940	07/18/80	[illegible]	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
231-814-203	04/03/81	[illegible]	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
229-498-977	10/03/80	[illegible]	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
228-063-277	07/14/81	[illegible]	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
230-053-001	09/23/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
231-897-588	06/25/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
231-887-084	02/03/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
231-792-359	02/05/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
~~251-051-876~~	~~07/19/81~~	~~[illegible]~~		~~E~~	~~7~~	~~N~~			~~N~~	~~N~~	~~N/A~~			
231-897-083	06/20/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
236-685-665	07/29/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
237-491-865	01/28/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
230-158-321	12/31/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
					TOTAL									

166

167

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 6 Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SEX	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled 18
231-897-380	11/19/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
243-342-789	09/12/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
243-181-302	07/27/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
250-900-610	04/04/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
230-052-904	09/04/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
230-052-789	01/03/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
232-023-937	01/24/81	H	Span	E	7	N			N	N	N/A			
					TOTAL									

165 169

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 7th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): (LEP) EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
243-180-437	03/12/79	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
229-673-231	02/21/79	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
229-341-508	11/24/79	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
224-472-415	05/26/80	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
237-509-930	12/19/80	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-108-151	07/28/80	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-044-497	02/11/80	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
245-128-814	10/10/78	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
251-026-464	10/09/79	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
238-880-330	05/19/80	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
250-900-529	03/12/79	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
243-180-205	09/09/80	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-050-551	10/16/80	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
					TOTAL									

170

171

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 7th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
229-672-860	01/06/80	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
233-239-300	08/05/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
243-238-367	05/13/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-044-711	08/11/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
225-959-378	07/18/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
229-857-990	03/29/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-110-793	07/27/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
229-673-272	10/23/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
229-672-837	03/24/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
243-181-294	06/13/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-044-588	12/24/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
233-164-045	11/04/79	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
231-308-610	01/20/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-049-884	06/17/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
236-242-970	10/04/79	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
231-174-673	02/27/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
TOTAL														

173

172

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 7th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
234-401-487	11/03/79	H	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-110-751	08/22/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
228-412-714	11/19/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
233-496-033	10/06/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
231-458-217	03/09/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
231-416-132	02/17/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
229-673-322	09/25/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
238-881-254	02/19/81	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-103-327	03/07/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
227-895-323	11/06/79	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-044-398	09/25/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
231-618-109	11/08/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
230-044-380	07/06/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
237-496-740	06/13/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
229-673-629	05/24/80	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
236-035-002	09/27/79	H		E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
				TOTAL										

174

175

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 7th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP (EP)

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) [illegible]	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
230-044-356	01/28/80	[illegible]	Span	E	8	N			N	N	N/A			
TOTAL														

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 8th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SEX	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
229-322-334	09/26/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
241-309-731	10/09/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
244-082-103	04/20/78			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
247-101-165	10/25/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
230-048-704	12/18/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
247-963-127	08/15/78			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
241-308-808	01/29/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
229-862-461	01/20/78			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
241-308-949	07/29/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-404-141	08/18/78			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
236-037-701	09/19/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
230-044-158	10/30/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
248-176-349	04/10/79			E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
					TOTAL									

178 179

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 8 Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/ Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Doc. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
228-122-586	01/17/89	H	Span	E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-410-858	06/18/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-410-981	10/25/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
229-905-351	08/01/78	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-228-276	12/18/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
236-046-223	02/03/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-411-237	04/23/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
237-509-922	09/18/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-037-982	07/12/78	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-122-495	05/03/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
233-496-041	03/19/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
227-895-042	05/07/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-413-936	04/21/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-537-650	10/03/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
227-895-158	01/17/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
228-411-211	01/24/79	H	✓	E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
				TOTAL										

180 181

Worksheet 6.1
Student Information
and
Non-Test Data

Project Group

Project Year: 92/93 Grade: 8th Language Proficiency Group (Circle One): LEP EP

(1) Student I.D. #	(2) Birth Date	(3) Racial/Ethnic Background	(4) Language Background	(5) SES	(6) Years of Education Completed	(7) Left Project	(8) Retained in Grade	(9) Dropped Out	(10) Special Education Ref. & Placement	(11) Gifted & Talented Program Ref. & Placement	(12) Enrollment in Post-Sec. Educat. Institute	(13) Part. at Least 100 Days	(14) Number Days Attended	(15) Number Days Enrolled
228-410-791	08/05/79	H	Span	E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
247-963-135	10/16/78	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
227-790-482	07/09/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
227-895-075	12/20/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
229-861-778	08/09/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
224-904-656	11/18/78	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
227-701-885	06/20/78	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
229-499-538	02/02/79	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
226-111-714	10/31/78	H		E	9	N			N	N	N/A			
					TOTAL									

182

183